


Subject: [Fwd: comments on public display regs]
Date: Wed, 07 Nov 2001 17:59:13 -0500
From: "Ann Terbush"
Organization: NOAA
To: Gene Nitta
CC: Jennifer Skidmore

FYI

----- Original Message -----
Subject: comments on public display regs
Date: Wed, 07 Nov 2001 15:24:17 -0500
From: "Teri Rowles"
Organization: NOAA
To: Ann Terbush

Ann, I have attached my comments on the public display regs. After our conversations on Monday, I thought I should take another look at the proposed regs. I know that we have missed the comment deadline, but felt that I should let you know our concerns and questions.

 public displav regs comments nov 2001.wpd	Name: public displayregs comments nov 2001.wpd Type: WordPerfect (application/wordperfect6) Encoding: base64
---	---

Comments on Public Display Regulations

1. Would a permit be required for temporarily holding an animal in a research facility (would it be time limited whether we require a permit or not)?
2. Under section 3. Disposition for a special exemption purpose
para 2: “Captive marine mammals **which have been held in permanent public display facilities** may not be released into the wild.”
3. This proposed rule: end of para one: (4) establish a means for identifying parts taken from public display animals and authorize the importation of parts for ~~medical examination~~ diagnostic purposes.
4. Section 4. General Public display requirements
para 1: the conduct of intrusive research. THERE is no mention of IACUCs here and there should be. I would hope at some point we will be requiring approval by an IACUC in addition to the permit. Wouldn't this be the perfect time to do such?
5. Under section 6. Marine Mammal Parts
para 3: The proposed regulations would revise.... to allow for the import, with a specific MMPA permit (note CITES would still be required and do they not have to have MMPA to import under CITES or have you worked this out procedurally with FWS). Please clarify this in the final regs.
6. Under same section: why just limit this to import of samples for diagnostic purposes from US owned or formally owned animals. There is a GREAT need to be able to utilize some of our diagnostic capabilities for assisting other countries in their captive care. Is this out of our hands?
7. Same subject: there is still concern on the import/export of cell lines and of gametes. These should continue to be allowed only through permits.
8. Concern regarding the public comment period for retention of rehab animals in new facility or into permanent retention in research, public display, or enhancement. There is often a real need to move animals fast to new facility due to space, exposure to new diseases **from** incoming animals, or care. What flexibility will be provided that would allow this “temporary transfer” while the public comment period or permit is being done? The stranding network may be “stuck” with the bills to support an animal prior to this being done. Any help here for us?
9. There is still some confusion regarding the blurring of lines between displaying animals in rehab status and public display of animals held in permanent captivity. Please **try** to clarify the distinction in these regs such that they do not inhibit our intent for animals in temporary captivity being rehabilitated.